

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 11, 21, 38 and 62 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-24 and 26-66 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-24 and 26-66 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,097,389 issued to Morris, et al. (*Morris*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,166,735 issued to Dom, et al. (*Dom*) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,173 issued to Ubillos (*Ubillos*).

Amended claim 11 recites the following:

displaying a first list of reduced visual representations of a plurality of media objects ordered automatically in chronological order and grouped by media objects relating to one another;
recording an audio narration to be associated with at least one of the reduced visual representations;
displaying the recorded audio narration with a visual representation corresponding to a length of the audio narration;
displaying a second list of reduced visual representations of the plurality of media objects ordered manually, the second list having the audio narration associated with at least one of the reduced visual representations;
navigating among the reduced visual representations; and
displaying the plurality of media objects.

Thus, Applicants claim displaying a visual representation of a recorded audio narration corresponding to the length of the audio narration. Claim 1 is a means-plus-function claim that similarly recites displaying a visual representation of a length of an audio narration. Claims 21 and 38 are respectively a system claim

and a method claim that recite generation of a visual representation of a length of an audio narration.

Applicants agree with the Office Action that *Morris* and *Dom*, separately or combined, do not teach recording an audio narration to be associated with at least one of the visual representations. Further, neither *Morris* nor *Dom*, are cited to teach, nor do they teach a visual representation of a length of the recorded audio narration.

Ubillos is cited to teach recording audio narrations. Applicants agree with the Office Action that *Ubillos* does not explicitly disclose recording audio narrations for use with images. *Ubillos* teaches video editing specifically using “stored video clips.” See Col. 1, lines 6-12 (emphasis added). Additionally, *Ubillos* explicitly defines audio clips as “soundtrack corresponding to video” (Col. 1 lines 20-21), and does not disclose a graphical representation of the length of the recorded audio narration. Because none of *Morris*, *Dom* or *Ubillos* discloses a graphical representation of the length of a recorded audio narration, no combination of *Morris*, *Dom* and *Ubillos* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 11, 21 and 38.

Claim 2 and claims 4-10 depend from claim 1. Claim 12 and claims 14-20 depend from claim 11. Claims 22-24 and claims 26-37 depend from claim 21. Claims 39-61 depend from claim 38. Because dependent claims include the limitations from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4-10, 12, 14-20, 22-24 and 26-37 are not rendered obvious by *Morris*, *Dom* and *Ubillos* for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 62 recites:

means for storing digital stories, the digital stories comprising of imported stories and authored stories, each story comprising of a plurality of objects, wherein objects in the imported stories are ordered in chronological order;

means for authoring stories using stored objects;

means for displaying story tracks associated with the imported stories and the authored stories, wherein the display includes a graphical representation of a length of an audio track of at least one story track; and

means for navigating among the story tracks and among the objects on a story track.

Thus, Applicants claim displaying a graphical representation of a length of an audio narration. As discussed above, none of *Morris*, *Dom* or *Ubillos* discloses a graphical representation of the length of a recorded audio narration. Therefore, no combination of *Morris*, *Dom* and *Ubillos* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 62.

Claims 63-66 depend from claim 62. Because dependent claims include the limitations from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 63-66 are not rendered obvious by *Morris*, *Dom* and *Ubillos* for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-24 and 26-66 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present

Application No. 09/465,982
Amendment dated January 27, 2004
Response to Final Office Action of August 27, 2003

Atty. Docket No. 074451.P108
Examiner Tran, Mylinh T.
TC/A.U. 2174

application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit

Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: JAN 27, 2004

Paul A. Mendonsa
Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with
the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient
postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

27 JANUARY 2004
Date of Deposit
DEBORAH L. HIGDON
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence
[Signature] 1/27/04
Signature Date